

REMARKS

Prosecution on the merits was reopened in this case. The examiner objected to claim 20 being used twice. This has been corrected. The examiner rejected claims 9-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakashima et al.

The applicant has amended some of the claims to better describe and claim the scope of the present invention.

The examiner states that for claims 9, 17 and 21 (renumbered claim 20), that Nakashima teaches a "means for providing said road construction information to said telematics system from said central location, whereby said telematics system displays said road construction information along with said map information". The examiner cites Nakashima col. 17, line 52 - col. 18, line 5. However, nowhere in this cite does Nakashima teach displaying construction information. Rather, Nakashima teaches displaying guidance information (line 61) and displaying a new expressway (line 67) and a route (lines 1 and 3). Neither of these relates to road construction. The examiner also cites Nakashima col. 31 lines 37-48 for this element; however, Nakashima teaches "...a map including

a route and landmarks is displayed on the display section...: (col. 31, lines 44-45).

Regarding claim 13, the examiner states that Nakashima teaches lane information at col. 12 lines 40-50 and col. 39, lines 44-53. However, the claim does not claim lane information; the claim claims information relating to lanes that are affected by construction. Nakashima, col. 12, lines 40-50 teaches "a lane change before a branching point" (lines 47-48). Nakashima col. 39, lines 44-53 teaches route guidance information (lines 47 and 50) and road length (lines 50-52).

Regarding construction work times, the examiner cites fig. 2, col. 6, lines 21-23 and col. 8, lines 37-40). However, Nakashima fig. 2 teaches only road length (the word "work" does not appear on fig. 2. Nakashima col. 6, lines 21-23 describes fig. 2: "Fig. 2 is a time chart of operations of an information center ...". There is no mention of work time, only of a time chart for a center. Nakashima col. 8, lines 37-40 teaches "a location and a date and time of occurrence of a traffic jam..". Again, there is no teaching of work times. The time of a traffic jam does not have any direct relation to work times. Just because there is construction does not mean there will necessarily be a traffic jam.

Regarding claim 20 (regular numbering) (before amendment), the examiner states that Nakashima teaches presenting a map showing a construction area and cites col. 8, lines 5-40. However, Nakashima col. 8, lines 5-40 teach "information such as map information covering intersections and roads, landmark information indicating major facilities" (lines 9-10), updating a database with information such as "traffic congestion information, traffic accident information, road construction information ..." (lines 25-27). "Each item of traffic congestion information, traffic accident information, road construction information, ... is collected in the form of a location and a date and time of occurrence and other information". Storing road construction information in a database is not the same as displaying road construction information on a map.

For the above-stated reasons, the examiner will find that the case is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is respectfully requested to place the case in condition for allowance at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully Submitted

Clifford Kraft

Clifford H. Kraft

Reg. No. 35,229

Attorney of Record

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

Clifford H. Kraft
320 Robin Hill Dr.
Naperville, IL 60540

708 528-9092 tel.

This paper is being submitted by United States First Class
Mail addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 with sufficient postage on:

Date: Nov. 9, 2005

Signature: *Clifford Kraft*

Name: Clifford H. Kraft